arXiv:1511.08609v2 [math.OC] 11 Sep 2016

Centerpoints: A link between optimization and convex geometry

Amitabh Basu Timm Oertel

September 13, 2016

Abstract

We introduce a concept that generalizes several different notions of a "centerpoint" in the literature. We develop an oracle-based algorithm for convex mixed-integer optimization based on centerpoints. Further, we show that algorithms based on centerpoints are "best possible" in a certain sense. Motivated by this, we establish several structural results about this concept and provide efficient algorithms for computing these points. Our main motivation is to understand the complexity of oracle based convex mixed-integer optimization.

1 Introduction

We consider the following unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d} g(x,y). \tag{1}$$

where $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function. To keep the problem as general as possible, we assume that g can be accessed only by a first-order evaluation oracle. In other words, when queried at a point (x, y), the oracle returns the corresponding function value $g(x, y)$ and an element from the subdifferential $\partial g(x, y)$. This allows us to model very general, possibly non-smooth, convex functions. The only additional assumption we make to keep (1) tractable, is that the minimization problem is bounded.

We present a general cutting plane algorithm based on the concept of *centerpoints*, which we define below. We call it the *centerpoint algorithm*. Our approach bears similarities to a number of continuous convex minimization algorithms and to Lenstra-type algorithms [31, 20] for convex integer optimization problems. Most variations of Lenstra-type algorithms rely on a combination of the ellipsoid method and enumeration on lower dimensional subproblems [27, 24, 33, 25, 38, 12]. The key difference is that our algorithm avoids enumerating low dimensional subproblems.

The main feature of this approach is that, from the point of view of the number of function oracle calls, this algorithm is best possible, upto a lower

order factor. For this purpose, we present our results for a somewhat general convex optimization problem (see Section 2 for details), and then specialize the results to continuous/integer/mixed-integer convex optimization. We now proceed to the central concept of this paper[1].

1.1 Centerpoints

Let μ be a Borel-measure[2] on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$. Without any loss of generality, we normalize the measure to be a probability measure, i.e., $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) = 1$. For $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ closed, we define the set of *centerpoints* $\mathcal{C}(S, \mu) \subset S$ as the set that attains the following maximum

$$\mathcal{F}(S, \mu) := \max_{x \in S} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \mu(H^+(u, x)), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ denotes the $(n-1)$-dimensional sphere and $H^+(u, x)$ denotes the half-space $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u \cdot (y - x) \geq 0\}$. This definition unifies several definitions from convex geometry, computer science and statistics. Two notable examples are:

1. *Winternitz measure of symmetry.* Let μ be the Lebesgue measure restricted to a convex body K (i.e., K is compact and has a non-empty interior), or equivalently, the uniform probability measure on K, and let $S = \mathbb{R}^n$. $\mathcal{F}(S, \mu)$ in this setting is known in the literature as the *Winternitz measure of symmetry* of K, and the centerpoints $\mathcal{C}(S, \mu)$ are the "points of symmetry" of K. This notion was studied by Grünbaum in [22] and surveyed by the same author (along with other measures of symmetry for convex bodies) in [23]. Caplin and Nalebuff [10] generalize Grünbaum's results to measures μ with a concave density supported on a compact set K. Another interesting property was proved by Funk [18]: A convex body is centrally symmetric about $\mathcal{C}(S, \mu)$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}(S, \mu) = \frac{1}{2}$.

2. *Tukey depth and median.* In statistics and computational geometry, the function $f_\mu : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$f_\mu(x) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \mu(H^+(u, x)) \tag{3}$$

   is known as the *halfspace depth function* or the *Tukey depth function* for the measure μ, first introduced by Tukey [42]. Taking $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, the centerpoints $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ are known as the *Tukey medians* of the probability

[1] Parts of the results presented in this paper appear in the second author's dissertation [37] and in the Proceedings of IPCO 2016 [4].

[2] The reader who is unfamiliar with measure theory, may simply consider μ to be the volume measure or the mixed-integer measure on the mixed-integer lattice, i.e., $\mu(C)$ returns the volume of C or the "mixed-integer volume" of the mixed-integer lattice points inside C, where C will usually be a convex body. The "mixed-integer volume" reduces to the number of integer points when the lattice is the set of integer points. See (7) for a precise definition which generalizes both the standard volume and the "counting measure" for the integer lattice.

measure μ, and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ is known as the maximum *Tukey depth* of μ. Tukey introduced the concept when μ is a finite sum of Dirac measures (i.e., a finite set of points with the counting measure), but the concept has been generalized to other probability measures and analyzed from structural, [15, 40, 29], as well as computational perspectives [40, 11, 9, 17]. See [34] for a survey of structural aspects and other notions of "depth" used in statistics, and [17] and the references therein for a survey and recent approaches to computational aspects of the Tukey depth.

1.2 Our Results

To the best of our knowledge, all related notions of centerpoints in the literature always insist on the set S being $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., the centerpoint can be any point from the Euclidean space. We consider more general S, as this allows us to analyze convex optimization problems where the solutions have to satisfy side constraints like mixed-integer constraints, sparsity constraints (e.g. compressed sensing), or complementarity constraints. Essentially, the closed subset S is going to represent non-convex feasibility constraints of our optimization problem; at the most general level, all we require from S is that it is closed.

In Section 2, we elaborate on this connection between centerpoints and algorithms for optimizing convex functions over general closed S. We first give an algorithm for solving such problems given access to first-order (separation) oracles, based on centerpoints. In Section 2.1, we focus on convex *mixed-integer* optimization and show that the centerpoint algorithms is "best possible" in a certain sense, amongst a large class of first-order oracle based methods – see Table 1. This comprises our main motivation in studying centerpoints.

In Section 3, we present general properties of centerpoints for general S. In particular, we establish lower bounds on $\mathcal{F}(S, \mu)$ in terms of the Helly number of S (see Theorem 13).

In Section 4, we show that when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and μ is the uniform measure on convex bodies, centerpoints are unique. To the best of our knowledge, this basic result was not known earlier in the literature. We also present a new technique to lower bound $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \nu)$ where ν is the "mixed-integer" uniform measure on $K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and K is some convex body. Such bounds immediately imply bounds on the complexity of oracle-based convex mixed-integer optimization algorithms.

In Section 5, we present a number of exact and approximation algorithms for computing centerpopints. To the best of our knowledge, the computational study of centerpoints has only been done for measures μ that are a finite sum of Dirac measures, i.e., for finite point sets, or when μ is the uniform measure on two dimensional polygons (e.g. see [8] and the references therein). We initiate a study for other measures; in particular, the uniform measure on a convex body, the counting measure on the integer points in a convex body, and the mixed-integer volume of the mixed-integer points in a convex body. All our algorithms are exponential in the dimension n but polynomial in the remaining input data, so these are polynomial time algorithms if n is assumed to be a

constant. Algorithms that are polynomial in n are likely to not exist because of the reduction to the so-called *closed hemisphere problem* – see Chapter 7 in Bremner, Fukuda and Rosta [32].

Throughout this paper we use the notation $H^-(u,x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u \cdot (y - x) \leq 0\}$ and $H(u,x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u \cdot (y-x) = 0\}$ for $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

2 The connection to optimization

We consider a very general setting. Given a closed set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in S} g(x). \tag{4}$$

where $g : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function given by a first-order evaluation oracle. We first define the class of algorithms against which we will compare the centerpoint-algorithm.

Definition 1 (CUTTING PLANE ALGORITHM)**.** *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set and let ν be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. A* cutting plane algorithm *for* (4) *with* stopping criterion based on ν *is an algorithm with the following structure:*

> **INPUT:** *An error guarantee $\delta > 0$, a real number $V > 0$, and a convex set P_0 that contains the optimal solution in its interior and with $\nu(P_0) = V$.*
>
> **ITERATIONS:** *At each iteration $i = 1, 2 \ldots$ the algorithm makes a call to a first-order oracle for g at a point $x_i \in \text{int}(P_{i-1}) \cap S$, which returns the function value $g(x_i)$ and a subgradient $h_i \in \partial g(x_i)$. We define $x^\star := \text{argmin}_{j=1,\ldots,i} g(x_j)$ and define P_i such that*
>
> $$P_i \supseteq \{x \in P_0 \mid g(x^\star) - g(x_j) \geq h_j \cdot (x - x_j),\ j = 1, \ldots, i\}. \tag{5}$$
>
> **OUTPUT:** *The cutting plane algorithm stops at the N-th iteration when $\nu(\text{int}(P_N)) \leq \delta$ and returns $x^\star$.*

When $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and ν is the standard Lebesgue measure, we obtain the class of standard cutting plane algorithms for continuous convex optimization, such as the Ellipsoid method, Method of centers of gravity, Kelly method or the Level method [36, Section 3]. This type of idea was also explored by Bertsimas and Vempala in [7] for continuous convex optimization. When $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$ and ν is the counting measure for $\mathbb{Z}^n$, we obtain cutting plane algorithms for convex integer optimization problems (one can also keep the measure ν to be the Lebesgue measure, which would produce a different class of algorithms). When $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we obtain algorithms for convex mixed-integer optimization. A natural choice of the measure would be the mixed-integer measure $\bar{\mu}_{mixed}$, which we will discuss in the next section.

Remark 2. *We give a short justification of our stopping criterion in Definition 1. Given general convex functions and the absence of any known structure for S, one can only guarantee an approximate solution from an algorithmic point of view in general (for structured S like $\mathbb{Z}^n$, the situation can be different). Typically, the quality of such approximations is then quantified by an additive or multiplicative gap with respect to the optimal function value, provided that it exists. Instead of considering the gap in the function values, we try to approximate an optimal point and we quantify this by an appropriate measure μ. This enables us to introduce a more general algorithmic approach and, in particular, we circumvent an additional source of error, when deriving lower and upper bounds on the number of functional oracle calls. In the end of Section 2.1, we elaborate on how to extend our results to derive bounds on the additive gap with respect to the optimal function value in the mixed-integer case.*

Definition 3 (CENTERPOINT ALGORITHM)**.** *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set and let ν be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The* centerpoint algorithm *is a cutting plane algorithm for* (4) *that chooses $x_i \in \mathcal{C}(S, \nu_i)$ from the set of centerpoints, where ν_i is the measure ν restricted to* $\operatorname{int}(P_{i-1})$*, and defines P_i to be the right hand side of* (5)*.*

For our general bounds we need three parameters related to S and ν.

Definition 4. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed subset and ν be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is finite for any bounded set.*

(i) For any bounded convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, define ν_C as the normalized finite measure ν restricted to C. We define

$$c(S, \nu) := \inf_{C \text{ compact, convex}} \mathcal{F}(S, \nu_C).$$

(ii) We define the degeneracy parameter

$$\chi(S, \nu) := \max_{y \in S} \min_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \nu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u \cdot x = u \cdot y\}).$$

(iii) We say that ν is lower semi-continuous if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and any open set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a closed set $\bar{K} \subset K$ such that

$$\nu(\operatorname{int}(\bar{K})) \geq \nu(K) - \epsilon.$$

A few remarks; In Theorem 13 we will show that $c(S, \nu) \geq h(S)^{-1}$, where h denotes the Helly number. However, for certain types of measures one can obtain stronger bounds, e.g., see Corollary 7. Note that the parameter χ is zero when S corresponds to the whole space, a mixed-integer lattice or to sets obtained from sparsity constraints on the variables. However, if $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$ and ν corresponds to the counting measure, then $\chi = 1$.

Our first general result showing the asymptotic optimality of the centerpoint based algorithm amongst cutting plane algorithms for (4) is the following.

Theorem 5. *[General Optimality bounds] Let S be a closed set, a measure ν that is finite for bounded sets and is lower semi-continuous (as defined in part (iii) of Definition 4), $\delta > 0$ and $V > 0$. The centerpoint algorithm makes at most*

$$\left\lceil \log_{\frac{1}{1-c(S,\nu)}} \left(\frac{V}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil$$

first-order oracle calls for any convex function g. Moreover, for any cutting plane based algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ with a stopping criterion based on ν, there exists a convex function $\hat{g}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ will make at least

$$\left\lceil \left(\log_2 \left(\frac{V}{\delta + \chi(S,\nu)} \right) \right) \right\rceil - 1$$

first-order function oracle calls to $\hat{g}$.

Proof. The upper bound follows from the fact that by choosing the centerpoint at every iteration, one can guarantee that $\nu(\text{int}(P_i)) \leq (1 - c(S,\nu))\nu(\text{int}(P_{i-1}))$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, N$, where N is the number of iterations such that $\nu(\text{int}(P_N)) \leq \delta$.

For the lower bound, it suffices to establish the following claim whose proof appears below.

Claim 6. *For any cutting plane algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ and a real number $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence of convex functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that for every $i \geq 1$, if $\mathcal{A}$ runs for i iterations on g_i, then $\nu(\text{int}(P_i)) \geq (\frac{1}{2})^i \nu(\text{int}(P_0)) - 2(\epsilon - \chi(S,\mu))$.*

To obtain the lower bound stated in the theorem from this, we do the following: Given $\delta > 0, V > 0$, set $N^* := \left\lceil \left(\log_2 \left(\frac{V}{\delta + \chi(S,\nu)} \right) \right) \right\rceil - 1$ and we run $\mathcal{A}$ on g_{N^*}. Using Claim 6 with $\epsilon = \frac{\delta}{2}$, we obtain that $\nu(\text{int}(P_{N^*})) \geq (\frac{1}{2})^{N^*} \nu(\text{int}(P_0)) - \delta - 2\chi(S,\mu))$. Since the stopping criterion for the algorithm is $\nu(\text{int}(P_{N^*})) \leq \delta$, the inequality implies that $\mathcal{A}$ requires at least N^* iterations to stop.

Proof of Claim 6. We construct the sequence $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ in an adversarial manner; we will actually construct $\text{epi}(g_i)$, the epigraphs of g_i[3], and use the fact that an epigraph defines a convex function uniquely and vice versa.

In fact, we will inductively construct three sequences: convex functions $\{g_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$, vectors $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, and real numbers $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that the following conditions hold for every $i \geq 1$.

(i) If algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ runs on the function g_i for i iterations,

$$\nu(\text{int}(P_i)) \geq (\frac{1}{2})^i \nu(\text{int}(P_0)) - (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{2^j}) \cdot (\epsilon + \chi(S,\nu)),$$

[3]For any function $f : \mathrm{R}^n \to \mathrm{R}$, the epigraph of f is $\text{epi}(f) := \{(x,t) \in \mathrm{R}^n \times \mathrm{R} : t \geq f(x)\}$.

(ii) For any $0 \le j \le i$, when the algorithm is executed for j iterations on g_j and g_i, it queries the same points $x_1, \ldots, x_j$.

(iii) For any $0 \le j \le i$, $\{h_j\} = \partial g_i(x_j)$,

(iv) Let $x_1, \ldots x_i$ be the points queried by $\mathcal{A}$ when executed on g_i for i iterations. Then,

$$\mathrm{epi}(g_i) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{i} \{(x,t) : P_0 \times \mathbb{R} : t \ge h_j \cdot (x - x_j) - \sum_{k=1}^{j} \xi_k\}$$

First observe that (i) of the claim implies $\nu(\mathrm{int}(P_i)) \ge (\frac{1}{2})^i \nu(\mathrm{int}(P_0)) - (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{1}{2^j}) \cdot (\epsilon + \chi(S,\nu)) \ge (\frac{1}{2})^i \nu(\mathrm{int}(P_0)) - 2(\epsilon + \chi(S,\mu))$. This would complete the proof of Claim 6.

We prove the claim inductively. Let $x_1 \in \mathrm{int}(P_0)$ be the first point queried by $\mathcal{A}$ on any convex function. Choose $h_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\nu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_1 \cdot x = h_1 \cdot x_1\}) \le \chi(S,\nu)$, and that $\nu(\mathrm{int}(P_0) \cap \{x : h_1 \cdot (x - x_1) \le 0\}) \ge \frac{1}{2}\nu(\mathrm{int}(P_0))$. Such a choice of h_1 always exists. Set $\xi_1 = 0$. Finally, define $\mathrm{epi}(g_1) := \{(x,t) : P_0 \times \mathbb{R} : t \ge h_1 \cdot (x - x_1)\}$. One can now check that (i)-(iv) in the above claim hold for $i = 1$.

Now, suppose we have defined $g_1, \ldots, g_i$, $h_1, \ldots, h_i$ and $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_i$ for some $i \ge 1$ such that (i)-(iv) hold. We now construct g_{i+1}, h_{i+1} and ξ_{i+1}. Note that by (iii), the algorithm chooses $x_{i+1} \in \mathrm{int}(P_i)$ where $P_i \supseteq \widehat{P}_i := \{x \in P_0 \mid h_j \cdot (x - x_j) \le -\sum_{k=j+1}^{i} \xi_k,\ j = 1, \ldots, i\}$. If $x_{i+1} \notin \mathrm{int}(\widehat{P}_i)$, then set $g_{i+1} = g_i$, $h_{i+1} \in \partial g_i(x_{i+1})$ (which is well-defined) and $\xi_{i+1} = 0$. Otherwise, by our assumption that ν is lower semi-continuous, one can choose $\xi_{i+1} > 0$, such that following conditions hold for $\tilde{P}_i := \{x \in P_0 \mid h_j \cdot (x - x_j) \le -\sum_{k=j+1}^{i} \xi_k - \xi_{i+1},\ j = 1, \ldots, i\}$:

(A) $\nu(\mathrm{int}(\widehat{P}_i)) - \epsilon \le \nu(\mathrm{int}(\tilde{P}_i))$ and

(B) $x_i \in \tilde{P}_i$.

Let $h_{i+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that the following all hold:

(a) $\nu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_{i+1} \cdot x = h_{i+1} \cdot x_{i+1}\}) \le \chi(S,\nu)$,

(b) $\nu(\mathrm{int}(\widehat{P}_i) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_{i+1} \cdot (x - x_{i+1}) \le 0\}) \ge \frac{1}{2}\nu(\mathrm{int}(\widehat{P}_i))$ and

(c) $\mathrm{int}(\{(x,t) : t \ge h_{i+1} \cdot (x - x_{i+1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{i+1} \xi_k)\}) \supseteq \widehat{P}_i \times \{\sum_{k=1}^{i} \xi_k\}$.

Condition (a) can be ensured by the definition of $\chi(S,\nu)$, (b) can be ensured by choosing one of the closed halfspaces corresponding to the normal minimizing the degeneracy parameter $\chi(S,\nu)$, and (c) can finally be ensured by scaling down h_{i+1} as required. Lastly, define

$$\mathrm{epi}(g_{i+1}) = \mathrm{epi}(g_i) \cap \{(x,t) : P_0 \times \mathbb{R} : t \ge h_{i+1} \cdot (x - x_{i+1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{i+1} \xi_k\}. \qquad (6)$$

To confirm condition (i), we observe that $P_{i+1} \supseteq \widehat{P}_{i+1}$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(\text{int}(P_{i+1})) &\geq \nu(\text{int}(\widehat{P}_{i+1})) \\
&= \nu(\text{int}(\tilde{P}_i \cap H_{i+1})) \\
&\geq \nu(\text{int}(\widehat{P}_i \cap H_{i+1})) - \epsilon \\
&\geq \nu(\text{int}(\widehat{P}_i) \cap H_{i+1}) - \chi(S,\nu) - \epsilon \\
&\geq \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(\text{int}(\widehat{P}_i)) - \chi(S,\nu) - \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

To verify condition (ii), by induction we simply need to verify that if $\mathcal{A}$ queries $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ on the first i iterations while executing on g_i, then $g_i(x_k) = g_{i+1}(x_k)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, i$. This follows from condition (c) above that was maintained during the choice of h_{i+1}. Condition (iii) also follows from condition (c) above that was maintained during the choice of h_{i+1}. Condition (iv) follows from (6) and the fact that inductively condition (ii) ensures that $\mathcal{A}$ queries the same points $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ on g_i and g_{i+1}. $\diamond$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5. $\square$

We obtain, as a special case, a known result of Yudin and Nemirovski [35] on the optimality of the centerpoint algorithm for continuous convex optimization:

Corollary 7. *[Continuous convex optimization bounds] The centerpoint algorithm is optimal amongst cutting plane algorithms for continuous convex optimization in terms of number of function oracle calls, upto the constant factor* $\log_2(\frac{e}{e-1})$.

Proof. Grunbaüm showed that when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and ν is the Lebesgue measure, $c(S,\nu) = (\frac{n}{n+1})^n \geq \frac{1}{e}$ [22]. Theorem 5 then gives the result. $\square$

2.1 A more refined analysis for lattices and mixed-integer lattices

In this section we consider the two cases $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and where μ is the "uniform measure" on a convex set intersected with S. More precisely, let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex set. Let vol_d be the d-dimensional volume (Lebesgue measure). We define the *mixed-integer volume with respect to* K as

$$\mu_{mixed,K}(C) := \frac{\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \text{vol}_d(C \cap K \cap (\{z\} \times \mathbb{R}^d))}{\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \text{vol}_d(K \cap (\{z\} \times \mathbb{R}^d))} \tag{7}$$

for any Lebesgue measureable subset $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$. For later use we want to introduce the notation $\bar{\mu}_{mixed}(C) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \text{vol}_d(C \cap (\{z\} \times \mathbb{R}^d))$. The dimensions n and d will be clear from the context.

Remark 8. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ be a convex body and let $\mu_{mixed,K}$ denote the mixed-integer volume with respect to K, as defined in* (7)*. One can show that in this case the infimum in* (2) *and* (3) *is actually achieved.*

We will show below that when $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$, and ν is the counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}^n$, $c(S,\nu) = \frac{1}{2^n}$, see Corollary 14. Note that when $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$, one can choose $\delta = 1$ in which case a cutting plane algorithm will return a true optimal solution because if $\nu(P_{N-1}) \leq 1$, this means there is exactly one integer point left in P_{N-1} and thus x_N must be an optimal solution. To this point we have made no assumption on our initial P_0, except that $\mu(P_0) = V$. It is possible to design P_0 such that either the lower or the upper bound provided by Theorem 5 are best possible. However, these are rather artificial constructions. A more common assumption is that an optimal solution $\hat{x}$ has a bounded representation, say $\|\hat{x}\|_\infty \leq B$ for some natural number $B \geq 1$. This would imply that we initiate the algorithm with P_0 being a box. For ease of presentation we will assume that $P_0 = [0, B)^n$, i.e., P_0 is not centrally symmetric to the origin. It follows, that $\mu(V)$ equals B^n and B^{n+d} for the integer and the mixed-integer case respectively. (Of course also other definitions of initial P_0's are plausible, for example balls. In these cases one could also do a more refined analyses as described below. In case of the ball the bound would differ only by a linear factor in terms of the root of the dimension. This is a consequence of the John's Ellipsoid Theorem.) Then, the bound in Theorem 5 says that the centerpoint based algorithm takes at most

$$\left\lceil \log_{\frac{1}{1-c(S,\nu)}} \left(\frac{V}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil = O\left(n 2^n \log_2(B)\right)$$

function oracle calls, where one uses the inequality $-\ln(1-x) \geq x$ for $0 < x < 1$ to deduce that $-\ln(1 - \frac{1}{2^n}) \geq \frac{1}{2^n}$. On the other hand, the lower bound in Theorem 5 gives

$$\left\lceil \log_2 \left(\frac{V}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil - 1 = \lceil n \log_2(B) \rceil - 1.$$

This exponential gap between the upper and the lower bounds can be improved using the lattice structure of S.

Theorem 9. *[Pure integer convex optimization bound] Let $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$, ν is the counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}^n$, $P_0 = [0, B)^n$ where $B \geq 2$ is an integer, and $\delta = 1$. Then for any cutting plane algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ there exists an instance such that $\mathcal{A}$ makes at least $2^{n-1}\left(\lfloor \log_2(B) \rfloor + 1\right)$ first-order function oracle calls on $\hat{g}$.*

Proof. The proof follows the same idea as in the proof of Theorem 5, except that this time we exploit the discrete structure of S. The important thing to illustrate is the choice of the subgradients $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ from that proof.

For each $v \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}$ we define the *fiber* $F_v := \{0, 1, \ldots, B-1\} \times \{v\}$ and let $S_0 := \cup_{v \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}} F_v$. We now construct the adversarial $\hat{g}$ in an analogous manner as in the proof of Theorem 5 by defining the adversarial sub-gradient halfspaces, or cuts. Whenever an algorithm queries the function oracle on a point $x \notin S_0$, then we can always choose the sub-gradient at x such that the halfspace contains S_0. Otherwise, if $x \in S_0$, we know by definition that $x \in F_{\bar{v}}$ for some $\bar{v} \in \{0,1\}$. We now choose the sub-gradient halfspace that removes at most half of the remaining points in $F_{\bar{v}}$ and keeps the remaining fibers F_v, $v \neq \bar{v}$ intact. It then follows that on each of the 2^{n-1} fibers, the algorithm has

to perform at least $\lfloor \log_2(B) \rfloor + 1$ function oracle calls. Therefore, in all, the algorithm must perform at least $2^{n-1}\left(\lfloor \log_2(B) \rfloor + 1\right)$ function oracle calls. □

For the mixed-integer case $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with the measure $\nu = \bar{\mu}_{mixed}$, we will show below that $c(S, \nu) \geq \frac{1}{2^n(d+1)}$, see Corollary 14. Similar to the pure integer case above, assuming we start with P_0 as the box $[0, B)^n$ for some natural number $B \geq 2$, the bound in Theorem 5 says that the centerpoint based algorithm takes at most

$$\left\lceil \log_{\frac{1}{1-c(S,\nu)}} \left(\frac{V}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil = O\left(2^n (d+1) \log_2 \left(\frac{B^{n+d}}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

function oracle calls. On the other hand, the lower bound in Theorem 5 gives

$$\left\lceil \log_2 \left(\frac{V}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil = (n+d) \log_2 \left(\frac{B}{\delta} \right).$$

However, similar to Theorem 9, one can improve the lower bound in the mixed-integer case too:

Theorem 10. *[Mixed-integer convex optimization bound] Let $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, and ν is the mixed integer measure on S. Then for any cutting plane algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ there exists an instance such that $\mathcal{A}$ makes at least $2^n \left(\log_2 \left(\frac{B^d}{\delta} \right) + n - 1 \right)$ first-order function oracle calls on $\hat{g}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 9. We can construct an adversarial function, that treats each fibre $F_v := \{v\} \times [0, B)$, where $v \in \{0,1\}^n$, as separate d-dimensional continuous problem.

For all fibers F_v, let δ_v denote the measure of P_N intersected with F_v. By the stopping criteria, it must hold that $\sum_v \delta_v \leq \delta$. By Theorem 5 we know that at least $\left(\log_2 \left(\frac{B^d}{\delta_i} \right) \right) - 1$ function oracle calls must be performed on each F_v, and by choosing our sub-gradient halfspaces in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 9, we obtain that the algorithm must make at least

$$N \geq \sum_{v \in \{0,1\}^n} \left(\left(\log_2 \left(\frac{B^d}{\delta_v} \right) \right) - 1 \right) = 2^n (\log_2(B^d) - 1) - \log_2 \left(\prod_{v \in \{0,1\}^n} \delta_v \right)$$

function orcale calls. Note that the last summand is minimized when $\delta_i = \frac{\delta}{2^n}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2^n$. Hence,

$$N \geq 2^n (\log_2(B^d) - 1) - \log_2 \left(\left(\frac{\delta}{2^n} \right)^{2^n} \right) = 2^n \left(\log_2 \left(\frac{B^d}{\delta} \right) + n - 1 \right).$$

This completes the proof. □

S	**Upper Bound**	**Lower Bound**	
$\mathbb{R}^d$	$O\left(\log_{\frac{e}{e-1}}\left(\frac{B^d}{\delta}\right)\right)$	$\Omega\left(\log_2\left(\frac{B^d}{\delta}\right)\right)$	(Yudin & Nemirovsky)
$\mathbb{Z}^n$	$O\left(n2^n \log_2(B)\right)$	$\Omega\left(2^n \log_2(B)\right)$	
$\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$	$O\left(2^n(d+1)\log_2\left(\frac{B^{n+d}}{\delta}\right)\right)$	$\Omega\left(2^n\left(\log_2\frac{B^d}{\delta}\right)\right)$	

Table 1: Best bounds for the convex optimization problem (4) with box constraints.

We finish this section with a few remarks. As it was already proven by Yudin and Nemirovsky [35], the centerpoint algorithm is optimal for the continuous case up to a constant factor. For the pure integer case we could prove that our algorithm is optimal up to a linear factor in n. For the mixed-integer case, if Conjecture 17 would be true, we would have an upper bound of

$$\left\lceil \log_{\frac{e}{e-\frac{1}{2^n}}}\left(\frac{B^{n+d}}{\delta}\right)\right\rceil.$$

In particular, this would imply that the cutting plane algorithm, using centerpoints, is optimal for mixed-integer optimization, up to a linear factor only in n, which would nicely unify the continuous and discrete optimization theory. See Table 1.

Next, we want to point out that it is not difficult to generalize the cutting plane algorithm to the constrained optimization case:

$$\min_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ h(x)\leq 0}} g(x).$$

where $g, h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are convex functions given by first-order oracles. However, it is crucial that the feasible domain has a reasonable measure, as otherwise it might be impossible to find any feasible point, let alone an approximate optimal point. Further, the algorithm can be extended to handle quasi-convex functions, if one has access to separation oracles for their sublevel sets.

Finally, note that for the purely discrete case, when $S = \mathbb{Z}^n$, we can guarantee to find the optimal point of (4), provided we choose $\delta < 1$. Only when there are continuous variables, we need to talk about approximations. Thus, let $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d \neq 0$. We assume that for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $g(x, y)$ is Lipschitz continuous in the y variables with Lipschitz constant L. Let $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ attain the optimal value $\hat{g}$ of Problem (4) and let $(x^\star, y^\star)$ be the best point that the cutting plane algorithm has returned with objective value $g^\star$. By standard arguments, we can bound $\bar{\mu}_{mixed}(P_k)$ from below as

follows

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mu}_{mixed}(P_k) &\geq \bar{\mu}_{mixed}(\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \mid g((x,y)) - \hat{g} \leq g^\star - \hat{g}\}) \\ &\geq \bar{\mu}_{mixed}\left(\left\{(\hat{x},y) \in \{\hat{x}\} \times \mathbb{R}^d \;\middle|\; \|(\hat{x},\hat{y}) - (\hat{x},y)\|_2 \leq \frac{g^\star - \hat{g}}{L}\right\}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\hat{g} - g^\star}{L}\right)^d \kappa_d,\end{aligned}$$

where κ_d denotes the volume of the d-dimensional unit-ball. On the other hand, after N iterations it holds that

$$\mu_{mixed}(P_N) \leq \delta.$$

Thus, we can guarantee that the algorithm returns a point satisfying $g(x^\star, y^\star) - g(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \leq L\left(\frac{\delta}{\kappa_d}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}}$.

3 General Properties

In this section we first establish some analytic properties of f_μ. This will justify the use of "maximum" in (2), instead of a supremum. The main result of this section is a bound on the quality of the centerpoints based on Helly numbers. We will denote the complement of a set X by X^c. We begin with a useful lemma.

Lemma 11. *For any probability measure μ, $f_\mu(x)$ defined in (3) is quasi-concave on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. For quasi-concavity, see Proposition 1 in [40], and for upper semicontinuity see Proposition 4 in [40]. □

Remark 12. *Lemma 11 shows that $\sup_{x \in S} f_\mu(x)$ is always attained. See Proposition 7 in [40] where this is discussed for $S = \mathbb{R}^n$. The generalization to any closed subset S is easy; see also Proposition 5 in [40] which states the for every $\alpha \geq 0$, the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_\mu(x) \geq \alpha\}$ is compact.*

Next we generalize a theorem well-known in the literature on half-space (Tukey) depth [40, Proposition 9]; this was earlier stated by Grünbaum [22, Theorem 1] for uniform probability measures on convex bodies. In all of these works, the authors consider $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, as discussed in the introduction. We consider more general sets S. For this we define the Helly number of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{K} := \{S \cap K \mid K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ convex}\}$. Then the Helly-number $h = h(S) \in \mathbb{N}$ of S is defined as the smallest number such that the following property is satisfied for all finite subsets $\{C_1, \ldots, C_m\} \subset \mathcal{K}$: If

$$C_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap C_{i_h} \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } \{i_1, \ldots, i_h\} \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$$

then

$$C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_m \neq \emptyset.$$

If no such number exists, then $h(S) = \infty$. This extension of Helly's number was first considered by Hoffman [26], and has recently been studied in [2, 1, 13].

Theorem 13. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed subset and let μ be such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S) = 0$. If $h(S) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{F}(S, \mu) \geq h(S)^{-1}$.*

Proof. The proof follows along similar lines as [40, Proposition 9]. It suffices to show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\}$ is nonempty. By standard measure-theoretic arguments, there exists a ball B centered at the origin such that $\mu(B) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\} \subseteq B$ (by Remark 12, $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\}$ is compact). By Proposition 6 in [40],

$$\begin{aligned}&\{x \in S : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\}\\ =&\bigcap\{H \cap S \mid H \text{ is a closed half space with } \mu(H) \geq 1 - (h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathcal{C} = \{B \cap H \cap S \mid H \text{ is a closed half space with } \mu(H) \geq 1 - (h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon)\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}$ is a family of compact sets such that $\{x \in S : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\} = \bigcap\{C \mid C \in \mathcal{C}\}$. For any subset $\{C_1, \ldots, C_{h(S)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of size $h(S)$, we claim

$$\mu(C_1^c \cup \ldots C_{h(S)}^c) \leq 1 - h(S)\frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

This is because each $C_i^c = B^c \cup H_i^c \cup S^c$ for some half space H_i satisfying $\mu(H_i^c) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon$. Since $\mu(B^c) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $\mu(S^c) = 0$, we obtain that $\mu(C_i^c) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Therefore,

$$\mu(C_1 \cap \ldots \cap C_{h(S)}) = 1 - (\mu(C_1^c \cup \ldots C_{h(S)}^c)) \geq 1 - (1 - h(S)\frac{\epsilon}{2}) = h(S)\frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0.$$

This implies that $C_1 \cap \ldots \cap C_{h(S)} \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, by definition of $h(S)$, for every finite subset $\{C_1, \ldots, C_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $C_1 \cap \ldots \cap C_m \neq \emptyset$. By the finite intersection property of compact sets, we obtain that $\{x \in S : f_\mu(S) \leq h(S)^{-1} - \epsilon\} = \bigcap\{C \mid C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is nonempty. □

By applying the well known bound for the mixed-integer Helly-number [26, 2, 13] we get the following Corollary.

Corollary 14. *$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mu) \geq \frac{1}{2^n(d+1)}$ for any finite measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}^{n+d} \setminus (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d)) = 0$. In particular, this holds for $\mu_{mixed,K}$ for any convex body $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$.*

4 Specialized Properties

4.1 Uniqueness of the centerpoint

For a general measure, the centerpoint may not be unique. We show below that in the special case when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and μ is the uniform measure on a general convex body, the centerpoint is unique. To the best of our knowledge, surprisingly, this question had not been investigated before.



Figure 1: This figure illustrates (8), which is the key idea of the proof of Theorem 15. Namely, that the loss of measure by rotating a minimizing half-space is smaller than when shifting. That is, the area hatched diagonally has larger measure, than the measure of the horizontally hatched area minus the measure of the vertically hatched area.

Proposition 15. *Let μ be the uniform measure on a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $C(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ is a singleton, i.e., the centerpoint is unique.*

Proof. We assume to the contrary that there exist at least two distinct centerpoints $x^1, x^2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ such that $x^1 \neq x^2$. Now we wish to derive a contradiction. Let $x^0 = \frac{1}{2}(x^1 + x^2)$. By Remark 8, there exists a $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\mu(H^+(u, x^i)) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $x^1 = e_1$, $x^2 = -e_1$ and $u = e_2$, where e_i denotes the i-th unit-vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

The idea will be to consider a perturbation $\tilde{u}$ of u, such that $x^1 \in \operatorname{int}(H^+(\tilde{u}, 0))$ and $x^2 \notin H^+(\tilde{u}, 0)$. Then, we show that the measure of $H^+(\tilde{u}, x^1)$ is strictly smaller than the measure of $H^+(u, x^1)$, contradicting the choice of u and the assumption that x^1 is a centerpoint. In particular, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(H^+(\tilde{u}, x^1)) - \mu(H^+(u, x^1)) = \quad & \mu(H^+(\tilde{u}, 0) \cap H^-(u, 0)) \\ & - \mu(H^-(\tilde{u}, 0) \cap H^+(u, 0)) \\ & - \mu(H^+(\tilde{u}, 0) \cap H^-(\tilde{u}, x^1)) < 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration.

We change from the Cartesian coordinate system to a cylindrical coordinate system. We define the variables $(\rho, \phi, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-2})$ as follows

$$\rho = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2},\ \phi = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}\right) \text{ and } x_i = y_{i-2} \text{ for } i = 3, \ldots, .n.$$

It is well known that the determinant of the corresponding Jacobian matrix is ρ. We can now, for example, express $\mu(H^+(u, 0))$ as follows

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} \int_0^{\pi} \int_{r(\phi,y)}^{R(\phi,y)} \rho \, \mathrm{d}\rho \, \mathrm{d}\phi \, \mathrm{d}y.$$

Let $D := \{(\phi, y) \in [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \mid \exists \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ such that } (\rho, \phi, y) \in K\}$. Note that the set D is a closed set in a normal topological space. We define the functions $R, r : [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as follows. For $(\phi, y) \in D$ we define

$$R(\phi, y) := \max\{\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid (\rho, \phi, y) \in K\}$$

and

$$r(\phi, y) := \min\{\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid (\rho, \phi, y) \in K\}.$$

Note that R is continuous on D. Hence, by Tietze's Extension Theorem [16, Theorem 5.1], we extend R continuously for $(\phi, y) \notin D$. Further, for $(\phi, y) \notin D$, we define $r(\phi, y) := R(\phi, y)$. Let $\tilde{D}$ be the set of discontinuities of r. Since r is continuous on $\text{int}(D)$ and $[0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \setminus D$, we have that $\tilde{D} \subseteq \partial D$. Since we know that $\int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}\phi \, \mathrm{d}y < \infty$ (because D is a compact subset), by Fubini we have that

$$\int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}\phi \, \mathrm{d}y = \int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}\phi.$$

For a fixed ϕ, we define $D_\phi := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : (\phi, y) \in D\}$. Observe for a fixed ϕ, the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : (\phi, y) \in \partial D\}$ is either ∂D_ϕ or all of D_ϕ. The latter can only happen for two values of ϕ, therefore we obtain

$$\int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}\phi \, \mathrm{d}y = \int_{\partial D} \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}\phi = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\partial D_\phi} \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}\phi = 0,$$

where the last equality follows because for a fixed ϕ the set D_ϕ is convex and therefore $\int_{\partial D_\phi} \mathrm{d}y = 0$. This implies that r is continuous almost everywhere.

Since 0 is a centerpoint and $u = e_2$ satisfies $\mu(H^+(u, 0)) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} R(0, y)^2 - r(0, y)^2 \, \mathrm{d}y = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} R(\pi, y)^2 - r(\pi, y)^2 \, \mathrm{d}y, \tag{9}$$

since otherwise a small perturbation of u would violate $\mu(H^+(u, 0)) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$

Next we want to approximate the terms in (8). Consider any $\epsilon > 0$. Since R and r are continuous almost everywhere, there exists a pertubation $\sigma_\epsilon > 0$ such that for almost all $(\phi, y) \in [0, \sigma_\epsilon] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ we have $|R(\phi, y) - R(0, y)|$, $|r(\phi, y) - r(0, y)|$, $|R(\pi + \phi, y) - R(\pi, y)|$, $|r(\pi + \phi, y) - r(\pi, y)| \leq \epsilon$.

We bound $\mu(H^+(\tilde{u}, 0) \cap H^-(u, 0))$ from above by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} \int_0^{\sigma_\epsilon} \int_{r(\phi,y)}^{R(\phi,y)} \rho \, \mathrm{d}\rho \, \mathrm{d}\phi \, \mathrm{d}y \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} \sigma_\epsilon [(R(0, y) + \epsilon)^2 - (r(0, y) - \epsilon)^2] \, \mathrm{d}y,$$

$\mu(H^-(\tilde{u}, 0) \cap H^+(u, 0))$ from below by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} \sigma_\epsilon [(R(\pi, y) - \epsilon)^2 - (r(\pi, y) + \epsilon)^2] \, \mathrm{d}y,$$

and finally $\mu(H^+(\tilde{u},0)\cap H^-(\tilde{u},x^1)) \geq \mu(\text{conv}(\{x^1\}, H(\tilde{u},0)))$, which we can further approximate from below by

$$\frac{\sin(\sigma_\epsilon)}{n}\int_E [R(0,y)-r(0,y)+R(\pi,y)-r(\pi,y)-4\epsilon]\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

where $E := \{y\in\mathbb{R}^{n-2} : \exists \phi\in[0,2\pi) \text{ such that } (\phi,y)\in D\}$.

In order to prove (8), it remains to show that there exists an $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\sin(\sigma_\epsilon)}{n}\int_E [R(0,y)-r(0,y)+R(\pi,y)-r(\pi,y)-4\epsilon]\,\mathrm{d}y\\ >&\sigma_\epsilon\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} [(R(0,y)+\epsilon)^2-(r(0,y)-\epsilon)^2]-[(R(\pi,y)-\epsilon)^2-(r(\pi,y)+\epsilon)^2]\,\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

By Taylor's expansion, we have $\sin(\sigma_\epsilon)=\sigma_\epsilon-o(\sigma_\epsilon^3)$. Together with (9) we can simplify the above inequality to

$$\begin{aligned}&(1-o(\sigma_\epsilon^2))\frac{1}{n}\int_E [R(0,y)-r(0,y)+R(\pi,y)-r(\pi,y)-4\epsilon]\,\mathrm{d}y\\ >&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-2}} 2\epsilon[R(0,y)+r(0,y)+R(\pi,y)+r(\pi,y)]\,\mathrm{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

As we let $\epsilon\to 0$, the right hand side goes to zero and the left hand side approaches $\frac{1}{n}\int_E[R(0,y)-r(0,y)+R(\pi,y)-r(\pi,y)]\,\mathrm{d}y$, which is strictly positive, because it corresponds to the $(n-1)$-dimensional measure of $H(u,0)\cap K$. □

Remark 16. *An interesting open question is the following: Is the centerpoint of a rational polytope rational? If so, is the size of the centerpoint polynomially bounded in the size of an irredundant description of the rational polytope?*

4.2 Better bounds for the mixed-integer lattice

We would like to improve the bound on $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d,\nu)$ coming from Helly numbers (Theorem 13 and Corollary 14) when ν is a mixed-integer measure. Better bounds have been obtained by Grünbraum for the purely continuous case ($n=0$), by exploiting properties of the *centroid* of a convex body K, which is defined as $c_K := \int_K x\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)$, where the integral is taken with respect to the uniform measure μ on K. Grünbaum proved in [22] that $\mu(H^+(u,c_K)) \geq \left(\frac{d}{d+1}\right)^d \geq e^{-1}$ for any $u\in\mathcal{S}^{d-1}$, which immediately implies that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mu)\geq e^{-1}$. This, of course, drastically improves the Helly bound of $\frac{1}{d+1}$. Note that, even though the centerpoint and centroid are equal for several extreme cases, this is in general not true. In the following we want to extend these improved bounds to the mixed-integer setting. Ideally, we would want to prove the following conjecture.

Conjecture 17. *Let $S=\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\nu := \mu_{mixed,K}$ for some convex body $K\in\mathbb{R}^{n+d}$. Then $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d,\nu)\geq\frac{1}{2^n}\left(\frac{d}{d+1}\right)^d\geq\frac{1}{2^n}\frac{1}{e}$.*

While we have not been able to resolve the above conjecture, we show that it holds in the regime of convex sets K with "large" *lattice-width*, where the lattice-width is defined as

$$\omega(K) := \min_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} [\max_{x \in K} u \cdot x - \min_{x \in K} u \cdot x].$$

In fact, we prove something stronger in this regime:

Theorem 18. *There exists a universal constant α such that for all $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ with $\omega(K) > 2cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^{n+1}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the following holds:*

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \nu) \geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}-1} + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1.$$

In particular, when $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is such that $e^{-\frac{1}{c}-1} + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1 \geq 2^{-n-1}$, we have $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \nu) \geq \frac{1}{2^n}\frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2^n}\left(\frac{d}{d+1}\right)^d \geq \frac{1}{2^n}\frac{1}{e}$.

We denote the projection of a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ onto the first n coordinates by $X|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$.

Remark 19. *Theorem 18 provides some evidence towards our belief in Conjecture 17. In particular, we see that it holds in two distinct regimes.*

Suppose the convex set K is such that $K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is "thin" in every direction; more precisely, suppose there exists a constant C such that for every unit vector e^i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have $\max_{x \in K} e^i \cdot x - \min_{x \in K} e^i \cdot x \leq C$. Then $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \nu) \geq \frac{1}{C^n}\left(\frac{d}{d+1}\right)^d$. This is witnessed by choosing the centroid of the fiber with at least $\frac{1}{C^n}$ fraction of the total mass of $K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ – such a fiber exists because there are at most C^n fibers intersecting K.

On the other hand, suppose K is such that $K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is "fat" in every direction; more precisely, the hypothesis of Theorem 18 holds. Then we get an even stronger bound than $\frac{1}{2^n}\left(\frac{d}{d+1}\right)^d$ from Theorem 18.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 18. The main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 18 is Lemma 20, where we show that for convex sets with "large" lattice width, the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure $\bar{\nu} := \bar{\mu}_{mixed}$ of $K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ can be approximated by the $(d+n)$-dimensional Lebesgue measure $\bar{\mu}$ of K and vice versa. (Note that in this case we do not normalize the measures.) In the pure integer setting, i.e., $d = 0$, this connection is well known. However, to the best of our knowledge, this kind of result has never been proven for the mixed-integer setting nor explicitly with respect to the lattice width.

Lemma 20. *There exists a universal constant α such that for all $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ and $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \geq cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^{n+1}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then the following holds:*

$$e^{-\frac{1}{c}} \leq \frac{\bar{\nu}(K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d))}{\bar{\mu}(K)} \leq e^{\frac{1}{c}}.$$

For the proof of Lemma 20 we need two technical auxiliary lemmata. The first lemma, Lemma 21, gives an ellipsoidal approximation of a convex body using the centerpoint as the center of the two ellipsoids used for the approximation. This is a variation on the classical Fritz-John ellipsoidal approximation result. In the second lemma, Lemma 22, we show that for a convex body K with "large" lattice-width, there exists a basis for the mixed integer lattice such that K contains a scaled copy of the fundamental parallelopiped of the lattice with respect to this basis, centered at the centerpoint of K.

Lemma 21. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact convex set with nonempty interior and let μ be the uniform measure with respect to K. Further let $x^\star \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$. Then, there exists an ellipsoid E centered at the origin such that*

$$x^\star + E \subset K \subset x^\star + n^{5/2}E.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $x^\star = 0$. We prove that for any $u \in S^{n-1}$

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \leq \left| \frac{\max_{x\in K} u^\mathsf{T} x}{\min_{x\in K} u^\mathsf{T} x} \right| \leq n^2. \tag{10}$$

It suffices to show the lower bound, since the upper bound follows from replacing u with $-u$.

Let $\left| \frac{\max_{x\in K} u^\mathsf{T} x}{\min_{x\in K} u^\mathsf{T} x} \right|$ be minimized at $u = \bar{u}$. Since the arguments below are invariant to scaling, we will assume that $\min_{x\in K} \bar{u}^\mathsf{T} x = -1$ and $\max_{x\in K} \bar{u}^\mathsf{T} x =: \alpha$, and assume to the contrary that that $\alpha < \frac{1}{n^2}$. Let $z := \operatorname{argmin}_{x\in K} \bar{u}^\mathsf{T} x$. We define for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the set $K_t := K \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u^\mathsf{T} x = t\}$. Further, we define $C := z + \operatorname{cone}(K_0 - z)$, $X_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid -1 \leq u^\mathsf{T} x \leq 0\}$ and $X_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 0 \leq u^\mathsf{T} x \leq \alpha\}$. Then $K \cap X_1 \supset C \cap X_1$ and $K \cap X_2 \subset C \cap X_2$. By Grünbaum's theorem [22, Theorem 2] we have that $1 - \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^n \geq \mu(K \cap X_1) \geq \mu(C \cap X_1) = \frac{1}{n}\frac{V}{\operatorname{vol}(K)}$, where V represents the $(n-1)$-dimensional measure of K_0. On the other hand we have $\left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^n \leq \mu(K \cap X_2) \leq \mu(C \cap X_2) = \left(\frac{(1+\alpha)^n}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\right)\frac{V}{\operatorname{vol}(K)}$. Combining these two inequalities, we arrive at the inequality

$$\frac{1}{e-1} \leq \frac{(\frac{n}{n+1})^n}{1-(\frac{n}{n+1})^n} \leq (1+\alpha)^n - 1 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^n - 1$$

However, $\left(1 + \frac{1}{n^2}\right)^n - 1 < \frac{1}{e-1}$ for all $n \geq 2$, leading to a contradiction.

We now define

$$sym(K) = \max\{\alpha \geq 0 : \alpha(-y) \in K \text{ for every } y \in K\},$$

a notion that was introduced by Minkowski, and extensively studied by Belloni and Freund [6]. Combined with Proposition 1 in [6], equation (10) implies that $sym(K) \geq \frac{1}{n^2}$. Then Theorem 7 in [6] shows that there exists an ellipsoid E centered at the origin satisfying $E \subset K \subset n^{5/2}E$. □

Lemma 22. *There exists a universal constant α such that the following holds for all $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ be a convex body and let $x^\star \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mu)$, where μ is the uniform measure with respect to K. If $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \geq cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^{n+1}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then there exists a matrix $B = [b_1, \ldots, b_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+d)\times n}$ such that*

$$x^\star + cnB[-1/2, 1/2]^n \subset K.$$

and $b_1|_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \ldots, b_n|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ forms a lattice basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$.

Proof. By Lemma 21, there exists an ellipsoid E such that $x^\star + E \subset K \subset x^\star + (n+d)^{5/2}E$. We define $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as the linear map such that $\phi(E|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$. Let $\Lambda := \phi(\mathbb{Z}^n)$.

Let $\widehat{B}$ be a matrix whose columns $\widehat{B}_{\star,1}, \ldots, \widehat{B}_{\star,n}$ form a Korkine-Zolotarev basis of Λ [28]. Then, a well known property is that

$$\|\widehat{B}_{\star,1}\|_2 \cdots \|\widehat{B}_{\star,n}\|_2 \leq \alpha n^n \det(\Lambda) \tag{11}$$

(see [30, Theorem 2.3]), where α is a universal constant. Further, the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization $\tilde{B}_{\star,1}, \ldots, \tilde{B}_{\star,n}$ of $\widehat{B}$ satisfies

$$\|\tilde{B}_{\star,i}\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{B}_{\star,i}\|_2 \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, n \tag{12}$$

and it holds that

$$\det(\Lambda) = \det(\widehat{B}) = \det(\tilde{B}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \|\tilde{B}_{\star,i}\|_2 \tag{13}$$

(see, for example, [21, Chapter 28]). Since $K \subset x^\star + (n+d)^{5/2}E$, the definition of the lattice-width $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})$ implies that

$$\|\tilde{B}_{\star,n}\|_2 \leq \frac{2(n+d)^{5/2}}{\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})} \tag{14}$$

Putting all these relations together, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have the following:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} (\prod_{i\neq n} \|\tilde{B}_{\star,i}\|) \cdot \|\widehat{B}_{\star,n}\| & \leq & (\prod_{i\neq n} \|\widehat{B}_{\star,i}\|) \cdot \|\widehat{B}_{\star,n}\| & \text{using (12)} \\ & \leq & \alpha n^n \det(\Lambda) & \text{using (11)} \\ & = & \alpha n^n (\prod_{i=1}^{n} \|\tilde{B}_{\star,i}\|) & \text{using (13)} \\ & \leq & (\prod_{i\neq n} \|\tilde{B}_{\star,i}\|) \alpha n^n \frac{2(n+d)^{5/2}}{\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})} & \text{using (14)} \end{array}$$

and thus we obtain

$$\|\widehat{B}_{\star,n}\|_2 \leq \frac{2\alpha n^n (n+d)^{5/2}}{\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})}.$$

If we change the order of the columns in $\widehat{B}$, the equations (11)-(14) still hold (with a different $\widehat{B}_{\star,n}$), and thus we obtain a bound on the Euclidean length of all Korkine-Zolotarev vectors, i.e., for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$

$$\|\widehat{B}_{\star,i}\|_2 \leq \frac{2\alpha n^n (n+d)^{5/2}}{\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{1}{n}\frac{1}{\alpha n^n}\frac{\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})}{(n+d)^{5/2}}\widehat{B}[-1/2,1/2]^n \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$$

Since $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \geq cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^{n+1}$, we obtain that

$$cn\widehat{B}[-1/2,1/2]^n \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}.$$

We now use the fact that there exists an affine subspace $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ of dimension n such that $E|_{\mathbb{R}^n} = (E \cap H)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. This follows from a repeated application of Lemma 3 from [14]. Let B be the matrix whose columns span the linear space parallel to H and these columns project to $\phi^{-1}(\widehat{B}_{\star,1}), \ldots, \phi^{-1}(\widehat{B}_{\star,n})$. B now satisfies the condition desired. □

We are now ready to prove Lemma 20.

Proof of Lemma 20. By Lemma 22 there exists a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+d)\times n}$ such that $x^\star + cn\,B[-1/2,1/2]^n \subset K$. Since $B|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is unimodular, we may assume after an unimodular transformation that $B|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ equals the identity matrix. After a further volume preserving linear transformation we may even assume that B equals the first n unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n+d}$. Since K is full dimensional, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $c\,n[-1/2,1/2]^n \times \epsilon[-1/2,1/2]^d \subset K - x^\star$. To make the calculations below easy, we translate everything by $-x^\star$, so that we assume below that $x^\star = 0$.

We next exploit that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k^d}|K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d)| = \bar{\nu}(K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d))$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality. We will use this fact to prove the following

Claim 23.

$$\left(1-\frac{1}{cn}\right)^n\left(1-\frac{1}{\epsilon k}\right)^d \leq \frac{\frac{1}{k^d}|K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d)|}{\bar{\mu}(K)} \leq \left(1+\frac{1}{cn}\right)^n\left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon k}\right)^d.$$

Proof. Let $Q := [-1/2,1/2]^n \times [-1/2k,1/2k]^d$. Further we define $\bar{K} := (K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d)) + Q$ and $K_{\lambda,\gamma} := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_n & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma I_d \end{pmatrix} K$ for $\lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Notice that $K_{\lambda_1,\gamma_1} + K_{\lambda_2,\gamma_2} = K_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2,\gamma_1+\gamma_2}$ and $Q \subseteq K_{\frac{1}{cn},\frac{1}{\epsilon k}}$.

Since $\frac{1}{k^d}|K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d)| = \bar{\mu}(\bar{K})$, it suffices to show that

$$K_{1-\frac{1}{cn},1-\frac{1}{\epsilon k}} \subseteq \bar{K} \subseteq K_{1+\frac{1}{cn},1+\frac{1}{\epsilon k}}$$

One of the containments follows from the observations that $\bar{K} \subseteq K + Q$ and $K + Q \subseteq K_{1+\frac{1}{c}n,1+1/\epsilon k}$. In order to prove $K_{1-\frac{1}{cn},1-\frac{1}{\epsilon k}} \subseteq \bar{K}$, suppose to the contrary that there exists an $x \in K_{1-\frac{1}{cn},1-\frac{1}{\epsilon k}} \setminus \bar{K}$. We define $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d$, such that $z_i = \lfloor x_i \rceil$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $z_i = \frac{1}{k}\lfloor k\,x_i \rceil$ for $n < i \leq n+d$.[4] Then, since $z - x \in Q \subseteq K_{\frac{1}{cn},\frac{1}{\epsilon k}}$ and $x \in K_{1-\frac{1}{cn},1-\frac{1}{\epsilon k}}$, we obtain that z must be in $K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Since Q is symmetric, $x - z$ is also in Q, and therefore $x \in z + Q \subseteq K \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \frac{1}{k}\mathbb{Z}^d) + Q = \bar{K}$, which contradicts the choice of x. ◇

[4] For $x \in \mathtt{R}$, $\lfloor x \rceil$ denotes the integer $z \in \mathtt{Z}$ such that for each component $|z - x| \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

We get the desired inequalities from Claim 23 by letting k go to infinity and using the fact that $(1+\frac{1}{cn})^n \leq e^{\frac{1}{c}}$ and $(1-\frac{1}{cn})^n \geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}}$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 18 we introduce the following technical rounding procedure. Let K be a convex body with a sufficiently large lattice width, i.e., $\omega(K) > cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^n\sqrt{n}$ for some positive integer c, where α is the constant from Lemma 20. Let μ be the uniform measure on K and let $x^\star \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{n+d}, \mu)$. By Lemma 22, there exist $b_i \in (-x^\star+K)\cap(\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$ such that $b_1|_{\mathbb{R}^n},\ldots,b_n|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is a lattice basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and $x^\star + cnB[-1/2,1/2]^n \subset K$. In addition we define $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ as the i-th unit vector for $i=n+1,\ldots,n+d$. Hence, $b_1,\ldots,b_{n+d}$ define a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n+d}$.

Given $x=\sum_{i=1}^{n+d}\lambda_i b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for all i, we define $[x]_K \in \mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d$ as $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lfloor\lambda_i\rceil b_i + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+d}\lambda_i b_i$, i.e., we round x to a close mixed-integer point with respect to K (the dependence on K is through Lemma 22 which defines the matrix B).

Theorem 24. *Let α be the constant from Lemma 20. Let $\nu := \mu_{mixed,K}$, where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+d}$ is a convex body and $\nu(K) \neq 0$, and let $x^\star$ be the centerpoint with respect to μ, the uniform measure on K. If $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n}) > 2cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^{n+1}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then*

$$f_\nu([x^\star]_K) \geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{d+n},\mu) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1.$$

Grünbaum's Theorem implies then, that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d,\nu) \geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}-1} + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1$, giving us Theorem 18.

Proof of Theorem 24. As before, let $\bar{\mu}$ denote the $(d+n)$-dimensional Lebesgue measure with respect to K and let $\bar{\nu}$ denote the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure with respect to $K\cap(\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e. they are not normalized.

In a first step we prove the following claim:

Claim 25. *For any half-space H^+,*

$$\nu(H^+) \geq \mu(H^+) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1.$$

Proof of Claim 25. Let H^+ be any half-space and let H^- denote its closed complement. The lattice-width of either $(K\cap H^+)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ or $(K\cap H^-)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is larger or equal than $\omega(K|_{\mathbb{R}^n})/2$. If $\omega(K\cap H^-) \geq cn(n+d)^{5/2}\alpha n^n\sqrt{n}$, then, by Lemma 20,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(H^+) = \frac{\bar{\nu}(K\cap H^+)}{\bar{\nu}(K)} &\geq \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K) - e^{\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K\cap H^-)}{e^{\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K)}\\ &= \frac{\bar{\mu}(K\cap H^+)}{\bar{\mu}(K)} + \frac{(e^{-\frac{1}{c}}-e^{\frac{1}{c}})\bar{\mu}(K)}{e^{\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K)}\\ &= \mu(H^+) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1.\end{aligned}$$

If $\omega(K \cap H^+) \geq cn(n+d)\alpha n^n\sqrt{n}$, then, by Lemma 20,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(H^+) = \frac{\bar{\nu}(K \cap H^+)}{\bar{\nu}(K)} &\geq \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K \cap H^+)}{e^{\frac{1}{c}}\bar{\mu}(K)} \\ &= e^{-\frac{2}{c}}\mu(H^+) \\ &= \mu(H^+) - (1 - e^{-\frac{2}{c}})\mu(H^+) \\ &\geq \mu(H^+) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} + 1.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since $\mu(H^+) \leq 1$ and $1 - e^{-\frac{2}{c}} \geq 0$. ◇

In the second step we bound the error made by rounding the $x^\star$ to $[x^\star]_K$. Note that this is done with respect to a matrix B that is returned from Lemma 22. We first make a unimodular transformation so that $B|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is the identity and then make an affine transformation so that B consists of the first n unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n+d}$. To make a further simplification, we translate everything by $-x^\star$ so that $x^\star = 0$.

Define $K_{\lambda,\gamma} := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_n & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma I_d \end{pmatrix} K$ for any $\lambda, \gamma \geq 0$. Since we assume $x^\star = 0$, our rounding procedure implies that $[x^\star] \in B[-1/2, 1/2]^n$. By Lemma 22, this implies that $[x^\star] \in K_{\frac{1}{cn},0}$. Therefore, $[x^\star] + K_{1-\frac{1}{cn},1} \subseteq K$. This implies that for any $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}$, $\mu(H^+(u, [x^\star]_K)) \geq (1-\frac{1}{cn})^n \mu(H^+(u, x^\star)) \geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\mu(H^+(u, x^\star))$.

Together with the previous claim it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\nu([x^\star]_K) &= \max_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}} \nu(H^+(u, [x^\star]_K)) \\ &\geq \max_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}} \mu(H^+(u, [x^\star]_K)) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1 \\ &\geq \max_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}} e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\mu(H^+(u, x^\star)) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1 \\ &\geq e^{-\frac{1}{c}}\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^{d+n}, \mu) + e^{-\frac{2}{c}} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

5 Computational Aspects

All our algorithms are under the standard Turing machine model of computation. We say that $x \in S$ is an ϵ-centerpoint for S, μ, if $f_\mu(x) \geq \mathcal{F}(S, \mu) - \epsilon$ where $\mathcal{F}(S, \mu)$ is defined in (2) and f_μ is defined in (3).

A central tool in the following algorithms for computing (approximate) centerpoints is solving convex mixed-integer optimization problems. The classical result here is due to Grötschel et al. [20]. This classical algorithm requires an access to a first-order oracle for the convex function at all points in $\mathbb{R}^n$. It can be modified to solve the problem with access to a first-order oracle that only queries mixed-integer points (as opposed to any point in $\mathbb{R}^n$). This modification will be useful for us in this section, in particular, for Theorem 29. For completeness, we give a description of the result most amenable for our purposes; an appropriate reference for this version is [38].

Theorem 26. *Let $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $B \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\delta \in O(B^{-n-d})$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a quasi-concave function equipped with an oracle that, for any point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in S$, returns an approximate function value $\bar{f}$ and an approximate separation vector $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}$ with the following guarantees:*

(i) There exists an optimal solution in $\operatorname{argmax}_{x \in S} f(x)$ *with norm at most B,*

(ii) $|f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) - \bar{f}| \leq \delta$,

(iii) $\|u - \bar{u}\|_\infty \leq \delta$ *for some* $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n+d-1}$ *satisfying* $\{(x, y) \in S : f(x, y) \geq f(\bar{x}, \bar{y})\} \subseteq \{(x, y) : u \cdot (x, y) \leq u \cdot (\bar{x}, \bar{y})\}$.

Then there is an algorithm that computes a point $x^* \in S$ such that $\max_{x \in S} f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon$. *Moreover, if n is fixed, the algorithm runs in time polynomial in* $\log(B)$, $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ *and d.*

5.1 Exact Algorithms

5.1.1 Uniform measure on polytopes

Since the rationality of the centerpoint for uniform measures on rational polytopes is an open question (see Remark 16), we consider an "exact" algorithm as one which returns an ϵ-centerpoint and runs in time polynomial in $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ and the size of the description of the rational polytope.

Theorem 27. *Let n be a fixed natural number. There is an algorithm which takes as input a rational polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon > 0$, and returns an ϵ-centerpoint for $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and μ, the uniform measure on P. The algorithms runs in time polynomial in the size of an irredundant description of P and* $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Proof. Since f_μ defined in (3) is quasi-concave by Lemma 11, an x^* satisfying $f_\mu(x^*) \geq \mathcal{F}(S, \mu) - \epsilon$ can be found using Theorem 26, if one has an approximate evaluation oracle for f_μ, and an approximate separation oracle for the level sets.

Implementing these oracles boils down to the following: Given $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\delta > 0$, find $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\mu(H^+(\bar{u}, \bar{x})) \leq \min_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x})) + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \|u - \bar{u}\|_\infty \leq \delta, \tag{15}$$

for some $u \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$.

Given $\bar{x}$, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all partitions of the vertices of P into two sets that can be achieved by a hyperplane through $\bar{x}$. (Note that, since n is assumed to be fixed, the number of vertices of P is polynomially bounded and they can be computed in time bounded by a polynomial in terms of the input-size of P.) This induces a covering of the sphere $\mathcal{S}^{n-1}$: For each $X \in \mathcal{P}$ define U_X to be the set of $u \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ such that the hyperplane $u \cdot x = u \cdot \bar{x}$ induces the partition X on the vertices of P. The number of such partitions is closely related to the VC-dimension of hyperplanes, and in particular, is easily seen to be $O(M^n)$ where M is the number of vertices of P. Moreover, one can enumerate these

partitions in the same amount of time, by picking $n-1$ vertices $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}\}$ of P such that $\{\bar{x}, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}\}$ are affinely independent.

To solve problem (15), we will proceed along these steps.

1. For each $X \in \mathcal{P}$, find $\bar{u}_X \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ be such that

$$\mu(H^+(\bar{u}_X, \bar{x})) \leq \min_{u \in U_X} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x})) + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \|u - \bar{u}_X\|_\infty \leq \delta,$$

   for some $u \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in U_X} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$.

2. Pick X^* such that $\mu(H^+(\bar{u}_{X^*}, \bar{x})) \leq \mu(H^+(\bar{u}_X, \bar{x}))$ for all $X \in \mathcal{P}$ and report $\bar{u}_{X^*}$ as the solution to (15).

To complete the proof, we need to implement Step 1. above in polynomial time. This is done in Lemma 28. □

Lemma 28. *For a fixed $X \in \mathcal{P}$, one can compute $\bar{u}_X \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ such that*

$$\mu(H^+(\bar{u}_X, \bar{x})) \leq \min_{u \in U_X} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x})) + \delta \quad \textit{and} \quad \|u - \bar{u}_X\|_\infty \leq \delta,$$

for some $u \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in U_X} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$, using an algorithm whose running time is bounded by a polynomial in $\log(\frac{1}{\delta})$ and the size of an irredundant description of P.

This lemma can be proved using methods from real algebraic geometry for quantifier elimination in systems of polynomials inequalities.

Proof. For a fixed partition $X \in \mathcal{P}$ the feasible region U_X is described by a system of linear inequalities $Au \leq b$ and a single quadratic equality constraint $u_1^2 + u_2^2 + \ldots + u_n^2 = 1$. We claim the objective function can be written as the ratio of two polynomials in $u_1, \ldots, u_n$. Subject to these constraints, we need to minimize $\mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$. Since X is the partition of the vertices of P induced by the hyperplane $u \cdot x = u \cdot \bar{x}$ (since $u \in U_X$), the set of edges intersected by this hyperplane is fixed. Moreover, the coordinates of the point of intersection of any such edge and this hyperplane can be expressed by a ratio of linear functions of $u_1, \ldots, u_n$. Indeed, suppose the edge intersected is the convex hull of the vertices $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that $u \cdot (\lambda v_1 + (1-\lambda)v_2) = u \cdot \bar{x}$. Thus, $\lambda = \frac{u \cdot (\bar{x} - v_2)}{u \cdot (v_2 - v_1)}$, and the point of intersection is $\lambda v_1 + (1-\lambda)v_2$ which is a ratio of linear functions of u. Also, $P \cap H^+(u, \bar{x})$ can be decomposed into a simplicial complex whose combinatorial structure only depends on X and not on the actual values of $u \in U_X$. The volume of $P \cap H^+(u, \bar{x}))$ can be written as the sum of the volumes of these simplices. Since the volume of a simplex can be written as a polynomial in the coordinates of its vertices, we obtain that $\mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$ is sum of ratios of polynomials in $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ with degree bounded by a function of n only, which can be written as a single ratio of polynomials in $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ where the degrees of the polynomials are bounded by a function of n only. Thus, finding $u_X \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in U_X} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x}))$ is equivalent to solving a mathematical optimization problem of the following type:

$$\min_{u_1,\ldots,u_n} \frac{p(u)}{q(u)} \qquad \text{s.t.} \;\; Au \leq b, \;\; u_1^2 + u_2^2 + \ldots + u_n^2 = 1.$$

The above is equivalent to the following polynomial optimization problem:

$$\min_{z,u_1,\ldots u_n} z \qquad \text{s.t.} \;\; p(u) = z \cdot q(u), \;\; Au \leq b, \;\; u_1^2 + u_2^2 + \ldots + u_n^2 = 1.$$

This optimization problem can be solved to within δ accuracy of the objective and the solution by performing a binary search on the objective value and using quantifier elimination methods for testing feasibility of polynomial systems of inequalities and equalities. For polynomial systems with a fixed number of variables this can be done in polynomial time in the size of the coefficients [5]. See also "Remark" on page 2 of [19]. □

5.1.2 Counting measure on the integer points in two dimensional polytopes

If we use the counting measure on the integer points in a polytope, the algorithm requires no accuracy parameter ϵ.

Theorem 29. *Let $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid Ax \leq b\}$ be a rational polytope, where $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m\times 2}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, such that $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \neq \emptyset$. Let μ denote the uniform measure on $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then in polynomial time in the input-size of A and b, one can compute a point*

$$z \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{Z}^2, \mu).$$

Proof. By utilizing the fact that f_μ is concave (Lemma 11) and Theorem 26, it suffices to show that for a given $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ one can compute in polynomial time

$$\bar{u} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{u\in\mathcal{S}^1} \mu(H^+(u, \bar{x})).$$

Let $g : [0, 2\pi) \mapsto [0, 1]$ be defined as $g(\alpha) := \mu(H^+((\sin(\alpha), \cos(\alpha))^\mathsf{T}, \bar{x}))$. The key observations are that g is piecewise constant and that the domain $[0, 2\pi)$ can be partitioned into a polynomial number of intervals S_i such that g is monotone on each of them. This implies, that in order to compute $\bar{u}$, one only needs to evaluate g at the beginning and the end of each interval S_i.

Let $l^+(\alpha)$ denote the line segment $P \cap \{\bar{x} + \lambda(\sin(\alpha + \pi/2), \cos(\alpha + \pi/2))^\mathsf{T} \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$ and let $l^-(\alpha)$ denote $P \cap \{\bar{x} + \lambda(\sin(\alpha - \pi/2), \cos(\alpha - \pi/2))^\mathsf{T} \mid \lambda \geq 0\}$. Observe that $g(\alpha)$ is monotone increasing if the line segment $l^+(\alpha)$ is longer than the line segment $l^-(\alpha)$ and $g(\alpha)$ is monotone decreasing if the line segment $l^+(\alpha)$ is shorter than the line segment $l^-(\alpha)$. Hence, the monotonicity can only change when the two lengths are equal. All those critical α can be computed by comparing each pair of facets. □

5.2 Approximation algorithms

5.2.1 A Lenstra-type algorithm to compute approximate centerpoints

As we already pointed out in Section 2, centerpoints can be used to design "optimal" oracle-based algorithms for convex mixed-integer optimization problems. In turn, it is possible to employ linear mixed-integer optimization techniques to compute approximate centerpoints. However, this comes with a significant loss in the approximation guarantee. Recall the definition of $\mu_{mixed,P}$ from (7).

Theorem 30. *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and let P be a rational polytope. Then in polynomial time in the input-size of P, one can find a point*

$$z \in \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d : f_{\mu_{mixed,P}}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2^{n^2}(d+1)^{(n+1)}} \right\}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 27, the statement holds for $n = 0$. Also, since Theorem 24 is constructive, there exists a $\bar{\omega}$ that only depends on n and d, such that the theorem holds true provided that the lattice-width of P is larger than $\bar{\omega}$.

By induction we assume that the result is true for $n-1$. Further, we may assume that the lattice width is smaller than $\bar{\omega}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the flatness direction of P is equal to n-th unit vector, i.e., $\min_{x \in P} x_n \geq 0$ and $\max_{x \in P} x_n \leq \bar{\omega}$. We define $P_i := P \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+d} \mid x_n = i\}$ and the corresponding uniform measure μ_i. By the induction hypothesis, we can compute $z_i \in \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d : f_{\mu_i}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2^{(n-1)^2}(d+1)^{(n)}} \right\}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, \bar{\omega}$.

We define the finite auxiliary measure:

$$\bar{\mu}(x) := \begin{cases} \mu(P_i) & \text{if } x = z_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, with a brute force approach, we compute the centerpoint z in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d, \bar{\mu})$.

It remains to show that $z \in \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d : f_{\mu_{mixed,P}}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2^{n^2}(d+1)^{(n+1)}} \right\}$. Let H^+ be any half-space containing z. Note that, for all i we have $\mu(P_i \cap H^+) \geq \frac{1}{2^{(n-1)^2}(d+1)^n} \bar{\mu}(\{z_i\} \cap H^+)$. Hence,

$$\mu(P \cap H^+) = \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{\omega}} \mu(P_i \cap H^+) \geq \frac{1}{2^{(n-1)^2}(d+1)^n} \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{\omega}} \bar{\mu}(\{z_i\} \cap H^+) \geq \frac{1}{2^{n^2}(d+1)^{n+1}},$$

where the last inequality comes from Theorem 13. □

5.2.2 Computing approximate centerpoints with a Monte-Carlo algorithm

In this section, we compute ϵ-centerpoints, but for any family of measures from which one can sample uniformly. However, now the algorithm's runtime depends

polynomially on $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, as opposed to $\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ as for the uniform measure on rational polytopes from Section 5.1.

Suppose we have access to two black-box algorithms:

1. OPT is an algorithm which works for some family $\mathcal{S}$ of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. OPT takes as input a closed set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and (approximately) computes $\text{argmax}_{x \in S}\, g(x)$ for any quasi-concave function g, given an (approximate) evaluation oracle for g and an (approximate) separation oracle for the sets $\{x \mid g(x) \geq \alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}}$. Let $T_1(S)$ be the number of calls that OPT makes to the evaluation and separation oracles, and $T_2(S)$ be the number of elementary arithmetic operations OPT makes during its execution.

2. SAMPLE is an algorithm which works for some family of probability measures Γ. SAMPLE takes as input a measure $\mu \in \Gamma$ and produces a sample point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ from the measure μ. Let $T(\mu)$ be the running time for SAMPLE.

We now show that with access to the above two algorithms, one can compute an ϵ-centerpoint for $(S, \mu) \in \mathcal{S} \times \Gamma$.

Theorem 31. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a family of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with an algorithm OPT as described above, and let Γ be a family of measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with an algorithm SAMPLE as described above.*

There exists a Monte Carlo algorithm which takes as input $(S, \mu) \in \mathcal{S} \times \Gamma$, real numbers $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and computes an ϵ-approximate centerpoint for S, μ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. The running time of this algorithm is $T_1(S) \cdot N^n + T_2(S) + T(\mu) \cdot N$, where $N = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}((n+1) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$.

To prove this theorem, we will need a deep result from probability theory that has resulted after a long line of research sparked by the seminal ideas of Vapnik and Chervonenkis [43], and culminated in a result of Talagrand [41]. The following theorem is a rewording of Talagrand's result [41], specialized for function classes with bounded VC-dimension.

Theorem 32. *Let (X, μ) be a probability space. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions mapping X to $\{0, 1\}$ and let ν be the VC-dimension of the family $\mathcal{F}$. There exists a universal constant C, such that for any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, if M is a sample of size $C \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}(\nu + \log \frac{1}{\delta})$ drawn independently from X according to μ, then with probability at least $1-\delta$, for every function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\left| \frac{|\{x \in M \mid f(x)=1\}|}{|M|} - \mu(\{x \in X \mid f(x) = 1\}) \right| \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof of Theorem 31. We call SAMPLE to create a sample M of size $C \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}((n+1) + \log \frac{1}{\delta})$ by drawing independently and uniformly at random from S (note that M may contain multiple copies of the same point from S). Since the VC-dimension of the family of half spaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $n+1$, we know from Theorem 32 that with probability at least $1-\delta$, for every half space H^+, $\left| \frac{|H^+ \cap M|}{|M|} - \mu(H^+) \right| \leq \epsilon$. Let μ' be the counting measure on M. Then we obtain that $|f_{\mu'}(x) - f_{\mu}(x)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, any $x^* \in \arg\max_{x \in S} f_{\mu'}(x)$ is an ϵ-centerpoint for

S. This can be achieved by calling OPT to compute $x^* \in \arg\max_{x \in S} f_{\mu'}(x)$. For this, we need to exhibit evaluation and separation oracles for $f_{\mu'}$. But notice that, by Lemma 11, this can be accomplished by simply implementing the following procedure: given $x \in R^d$, find the best hyperplane H through x such that $\frac{|H^+ \cap M|}{|M|}$ is minimized. This can be done in time $O(|M|^n)$ by simply enumerating all hyperplanes that contain $n-1$ affinely independent points from M. □

The following result is a consequence.

Theorem 33. *Let n and d be fixed integers. There exists a Monte Carlo algorithm which takes as input an integer $m \geq 1$, a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n+d)}$, a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, real numbers $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and returns an ϵ-approximate centerpoint when $S = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and μ is the uniform measure on $\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \mid Ax \leq b\}$, with probability $1 - \delta$. The running time of the algorithm is a polynomial in $m, \log(\max\{|A_{i,j}|, |b_k|\}), \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \log \frac{1}{\delta}$.*

Proof. By using classical results on maximizing quasi-concave functions over the integer points in a polyhedron [20], OPT can be implemented for the family $\mathcal{S}$ which is the collection of all sets S that can be represented as the set of mixed-integer points in a rational polytope. For $n = 0$, SAMPLE can be implemented for the uniform measure on polytopes using well-studied techniques, e.g., see Vempala's survey [44]. For $n \geq 1$, SAMPLE can be implemented for the uniform measure on mixed-integer points in a polytope by adapting a result of Igor Pak [39] on $d = 0$ to $d \geq 1$ and using results on computing mixed-integer volumes in polynomial time for fixed dimensions [3]. □

References

[1] Gennadiy Averkov. On maximal S-free sets and the helly number for the family of s-convex sets. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 27(3):1610–1624, 2013.

[2] Gennadiy Averkov and Robert Weismantel. Transversal numbers over subsets of linear spaces. *Adv. Geom.*, 12(1):19–28, 2012.

[3] Velleda Baldoni, Nicole Berline, Matthias Koeppe, and Michèle Vergne. Intermediate sums on polyhedra: Computation and real ehrhart theory. *Mathematika*, 59(01):1–22, 2013.

[4] Amitabh Basu and Timm Oertel. Centerpoints: A link between optimization and convex geometry. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization IPCO*, pages 14–25, 2016.

[5] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. On the combinatorial and algebraic complexity of quantifier elimination. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(6):1002–1045, 1996.

[6] Alexandre Belloni and Robert M Freund. On the symmetry function of a convex set. *Mathematical Programming*, 111(1-2):57–93, 2008.

[7] Dimitris Bertsimas and Santosh Vempala. Solving convex programs by random walks. *Journal of the ACM*, 51(4):540–556, July 2004.

[8] Peter Braß, Laura Heinrich-Litan, and Pat Morin. Computing the center of area of a convex polygon. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 13(05):439–445, 2003.

[9] David Bremner, Dan Chen, John Iacono, Stefan Langerman, and Pat Morin. Output-sensitive algorithms for Tukey depth and related problems. *Statistics and Computing*, 18(3):259–266, 2008.

[10] Andrew Caplin and Barry Nalebuff. On 64%-majority rule. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 787–814, 1988.

[11] Timothy M Chan. An optimal randomized algorithm for maximum Tukey depth. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 430–436. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004.

[12] D.N. Dadush. *Integer programming, lattice algorithms, and deterministic volume estimation*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2012. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Georgia Institute of Technology.

[13] Jesús A. De Loera, Reuben N. La Haye, Deborah Oliveros, and Edgardo Roldán-Pensado. Helly numbers of algebraic subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.02380*, 2015.

[14] Alberto Del Pia and Jeff Poskin. Ellipsoidal mixed-integer representability. *http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2016/05/5465.html*, 2016.

[15] David L Donoho and Miriam Gasko. Breakdown properties of location estimates based on halfspace depth and projected outlyingness. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1803–1827, 1992.

[16] James Dugundji. *Topology*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass., 1966.

[17] Rainer Dyckerhoff and Pavlo Mozharovskyi. Exact computation of halfspace depth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.6927v2*, 2015.

[18] P. Funk. Über flächen mit lauter geschlossenen geodätischen linien. *Mathematische Annalen*, 74:278–300, 1913.

[19] D Yu Grigor'ev and NN Vorobjov. Solving systems of polynomial inequalities in subexponential time. *Journal of symbolic computation*, 5(1):37–64, 1988.

[20] Martin Grötschel, Laszlo Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 2 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics: Study and Research Texts*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.

[21] Peter M. Gruber. *Convex and Discrete Geometry*, volume 336 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[22] Branko Grünbaum. Partitions of mass-distributions and of convex bodies by hyperplanes. *Pacific J. Math.*, 10:1257–1261, 1960.

[23] Branko Grünbaum. Measures of symmetry for convex sets. In *Convexity: Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium in Pure Mathematics of the American Mathematical Society*, volume 7, page 233. American Mathematical Soc., 1963.

[24] S. Heinz. Complexity of integer quasiconvex polynomial optimization. *Journal of Complexity*, 21(4):543–556, 2005.

[25] Robert Hildebrand and Matthias Köppe. A new Lenstra-type algorithm for quasiconvex polynomial integer minimization with complexity $2^{O(n \log n)}$. *Discrete Optim.*, 10(1):69–84, 2013.

[26] Alan J. Hoffman. Binding constraints and helly numbers. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 319:284–288, 1979.

[27] R. Kannan. Minkowski's convex body theorem and integer programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 12(3):415–440, 1987.

[28] Aleksandr N. Korkine and Yegor I. Zolotareff. Sur les formes quadratiques. *Math. Ann.*, 6(3):366–389, 1873.

[29] Gleb A Koshevoy. The Tukey depth characterizes the atomic measure. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 83(2):360–364, 2002.

[30] Jeffrey C. Lagarias, Hendrik W. Lenstra, Jr., and Claus-Peter Schnorr. Korkin-Zolotarev bases and successive minima of a lattice and its reciprocal lattice. *Combinatorica*, 10(4):333–348, 1990.

[31] Hendrik W. Lenstra, Jr. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 8(4):538–548, 1983.

[32] Regina Y. Liu, Robert Joseph Serfling, and Diane L Souvaine. *Data depth: robust multivariate analysis, computational geometry, and applications*, volume 72. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.

[33] D. Micciancio and P. Voulgaris. A deterministic single exponential time algorithm for most lattice problems based on Voronoi cell computations [extended abstract]. In *STOC'10—Proceedings of the 2010 ACM International Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 351–358. ACM, New York, 2010.

[34] Karl Mosler. Depth statistics. In *Robustness and Complex Data Structures*, pages 17–34. Springer, 2013.

[35] A. S. Nemirovsky and D. B. Yudin. *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1983. Translated from the Russian and with a preface by E. R. Dawson, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics.

[36] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization*, volume 87 of *Applied Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 2004.

[37] Timm Oertel. *Integer Convex Minimization in Low Dimensions*. ETH-Zürich, 2014. Diss., Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule ETH Zürich, Nr. 22288.

[38] Timm Oertel, Christian Wagner, and Robert Weismantel. Integer convex minimization by mixed integer linear optimization. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 42(6-7):424–428, 2014.

[39] Igor Pak. On sampling integer points in polyhedra. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics (Hong Kong, 2000)*, 10:319–324, 2002.

[40] Peter J. Rousseeuw and Ida Ruts. The depth function of a population distribution. *Metrika*, 49(3):213–244, 1999.

[41] Michel Talagrand. Sharper bounds for gaussian and empirical processes. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 28–76, 1994.

[42] John W. Tukey. Mathematics and the picturing of data. In *Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians*, volume 2, pages 523–531, 1975.

[43] Vladimir N. Vapnik and Alexey Ya. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 16(2):264–280, 1971.

[44] Santosh S Vempala. Recent progress and open problems in algorithmic convex geometry. In *LIPIcs-Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, volume 8. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2010.